



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,596	05/19/2005	Makoto Ishida	1217-051288	7258
28289	7590	01/24/2007	EXAMINER	
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			HARRIS, GARY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/535,596	ISHIDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gary D. Harris	1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/19/05.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

As to Claim 1, Hoyes ('276) describes a material stock wherein the tape is at least one of: exfoliated graphite, vermiculite, polycarbon, graphite, PTFE, low density or expanded PTFE, filled PTFEs, mica, ceramic fiber tapes and papers including graphite filled paper, cellulose based gasket papers, automotive gasket paper (Col. 4, Line 37-42). The seal further by comprises a plastic, inorganic (mineral), or fibrous material which is considered a base material (Col. 5, Line 41-45). In addition Hoyes ('276) discusses the low density of the material stock of the present invention may be easily impregnated with lubricant, sealant or adhesive material such as for example PTFE, graphite, molybdenum disulphide and silicone compounds, plastics resins and rubbers (Col. 3, Line 29-33). Thus Hoyes ('276) discloses water swelling mineral stuck or impregnated in a base material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 / 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 103 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hoyes, John et al. (US 6020276).

As to Claim 2, Hoyes ('276) teaches the seal stock material is plaited, including a central core (inner part of a gland packing material similar to applicants claim) to provide bulk and/or additional strength. The central core may itself be relatively soft and compressible such as, for example, a relatively loose knitted or plaited glass fiber textile material. Furthermore, the plurality of plaited or otherwise intertwined tape members formed around the core may still retain a high surface area to volume ratio to retain compressibility (Col. 3, Line 34-42). Hoyes ('276) does not recite an amount of sticking equal to or larger than $0.01 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$. However, these properties are inherent because the applicants and the inventors teach virtually identical structures with similar materials. The physical properties of similar materials will inherently be similar. The burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to show the prior art properties are different from those claimed. See *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F. 2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to adjust the amount of sticking of water swelling material to the gland packing base material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 & 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyes, John et al. (US 6020276).

. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyes ('276) as applied to claim 1 and 2 above, Hoyes ('276) does not specifically state a water swelling mica mineral. However, Hoyes ('276) does describe the use of micas and vermiculite for seals or packing rings (Col. 5, Lines 8-29). One skilled in the art would interpret the Hoyes disclosure of mica to include a water swelling mica.

The international search report was considered however, it was determined that since prior art did not mention the use of mica or water swelling minerals it was not pertinent to applicants invention.

Art Unit: 1773

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary D. Harris whose telephone number is 571-272-6508. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM - 5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol D. Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GDH



CAROL CHANEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 10/535,596
Art Unit: 1773

Page 6